



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,898	12/28/2001	Warner Lee Hines	1662-54100 (P01-3950)	1592

7590 09/27/2004

Jonathan M. harris
Conley, Rose & Tayon
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, TX 77253-3267

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,898

Applicant(s)

HINES ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor (Pub. No. US 2003/0100319) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Patent 6,744,880).

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 5, Contractor teaches a public switched telephone network device (page 1, [013] and Figure 1) comprising: a first subsystem (Fig. 1, 40); a second subsystem (page 2, [021] – MPC 40 interfaces with PDE or PDE's); a module (resides on SCP 28) for receiving location data from the first subsystem MPC 40, comparing that information to a PSAP database, and routing the call to an appropriately located emergency service.

Contractor does not specifically teach converting the outbound message to an inbound message if the destination for the message is the second subsystem; but rather comparing the location of the wireless device with a location of the wire line device, delivering the call to the wireless device when the location of the wireless device is not within a predefined vicinity of the location of the wire line device and vice versa (see abstract).

Jones et al. teach a method for conversion and routing of telephone calls arriving on a number of telephony interfaces is performed by conversion to dial number via database lookup, selecting of outbound pathway, and placing outbound call and switched connection to inbound call (see abstract and col. 2, lines 51-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Contractor's system (page 4, [0037]) to include the feature of converting the outbound message to an inbound message if the destination for the message is the second subsystem, as taught by Jones, in order to have more sufficient system and methods for sending SS7 messages between subsystems.

Regarding claim 3, Contractor teaches the network device is a service control point (Fig. 1, 28).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Contractor teaches the outbound and inbound messages are signaling system seven messages (abstract, Fig. 1, and page 2, [014]-[021]).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Contractor teaches comparing the location of the wireless device with a location of the wire line device, delivering the call to the wireless device when the location of the wireless device is not within a predefined vicinity of the location of the wire line device and vice versa (see abstract) reads on claimed "the module checks the destination of the outbound message by checking the destination point code contained in the message"; and Jones et al. teach a method for conversion and routing of telephone calls arriving on a number of telephony interfaces is performed by conversion to dial number via database lookup, selecting of outbound pathway, and

Art Unit: 2642

placing outbound call and switched connection to inbound call (see abstract and col. 2, lines 51-53) reads on claimed converting the message into an inbound message.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Contractor teaches a memory storing an inbound message (PSAP database); and a computer processor in which the first and second subsystems and the module operate (page 2, [0020] and [0021]).

Regarding claim 10, Contractor shows SCP 28 with intelligent functions. Contractor does not teach a first and second computer processor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that modifications and variations can be made to employ more than one computer processor.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10.

Regarding claim 12, Contractor does not teach the subsystems residing in each service control point are selected to maximize the likelihood that outbound messages from a subsystem will have another subsystem in the same service control point as the destination subsystem. Again, as mentioned in claim 1, it would have been obvious to select a subsystem in the same SCP as the destination in order to have more sufficient system and methods for sending SS7 messages between subsystems.

Regarding claim 13, Contractor teaches a 911 service and a position determining entity subsystem residing at the same service control point (page 2, [0021]).

Claims 14, 16, and 20 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

Regarding claims 17 and 21, Contractor teaches using the routing table to identify to route the call to an appropriate destination (page 2, [0021]).

Claims 18 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Contractor teaches when a calling party 22 places a call, an inbound message is sent to MPC 40 that interfaces with a variety PDE's (page 2, [0021]). Contractor does not teach updating the message stored in the memory to include the results of the processing the inbound message with the first subsystem and using the stored and updated message to send an outbound message. Obviously, during the process of receiving an inbound call, processing/comparing the location of the devices or the messages, these messages need to be stored and updated and used to send before sending to the second subsystem or desired destination.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McCann (Pub. No. US 2001/0046856) teaches methods and systems for mobile application part (map) screening.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 2642


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen

September 16, 2004


AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700